



Mary-Ann Warmerdam
Director

Department of Pesticide Regulation



Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

Glenn County Pesticide Regulatory Program 2007/2008 Performance Evaluation Report

**California Environmental Protection Agency
Department of Pesticide Regulation
1001 I Street
Sacramento, California 95814**

November 12, 2008

Performance Evaluation of the Glenn County Agricultural Commissioner's Pesticide Use Enforcement Program For the Fiscal Year 2007/2008

This report provides a performance evaluation of **Glenn** County Agricultural Commissioner's Office (CAC) pesticide use enforcement (PUE) program for the fiscal year 2007/2008 (07/08). The assessment evaluates the performance of goals identified in the **Glenn** CAC's 07/08 enforcement work plan as well as the CAC program's adherence to Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) standards as described in the Pesticide Use Enforcement Standards Compendium.

I. Summary Report of Core Program Elements

A) Restricted Materials Permitting (RMP and Site Monitoring Elements):

CAC staff issued 746 restricted materials permits in FY 07/08, down from the previous 5-year average of 858. Staff reviewed 3,520 notices of intent to apply restricted materials, also down from the 5-year average of 4,489. The restricted materials permitting (RMP) program element was found to meet DPR standards and work plan goals for FY 07/08.

B) Compliance Monitoring (Inspections and Investigations Elements):

I. Investigations (Priority and Non-priority)

The **Glenn** CAC had no investigations during 07/08 that met USEPA/DPR "priority episode" criteria. DPR Worker Health and Safety (WH&S) Branch tracks DPR assignment and CAC completion dates and reviews all human health investigations assigned to counties each year. WH&S provides periodic feedback to the EBL regarding thoroughness and completeness. The EBL reviewed the six non-priority investigations (including DPR WH&S and other complaints) CAC staff conducted during 07/08.

DPR WH&S tracking records indicate CAC generally met DPR standards for timely completion and submission of DPR assigned investigations. CAC followed DPR policies in conducting and preparing reports of the investigations, including keeping the EBL informed of the progress of the higher profile investigations in a timely manner. The EBL and WH&S review of CAC investigations indicated CAC met DPR standards for overall thoroughness and completeness.

II. Inspections (Agricultural and Structural)

The EBL reviewed a representative sample of the approximately 594 agricultural pesticide use monitoring inspections (including Field Worker Safety, field fumigations, mix/load, etc.), 45 records inspections (including agricultural pest control business employee safety and/or business records and employer headquarter), and 3 structural pest control business pesticide use/records

inspections conducted by CAC staff as reported on the Pesticide Regulatory Activities Monthly Report (PRAMR) during 07/08.

CAC PUE staff conducted a total of 642 inspections during FY 07/08. This is down from the previous 5-year average of 725 total inspections.

The EBL also conducted structural and agricultural oversight inspections with various CAC PUE staff during 07/08. Based on the combination of EBL records review, field observations, interviews at various times with CAC field staff, and follow-up discussions with PUE managers, it was determined CAC followed DPR policies and procedures regarding performing inspections with thoroughness and completeness, including associated follow-up activities.

Effectiveness Evaluation Findings: The CAC compliance monitoring program element for both inspections and investigations was found to meet DPR standards.

C) Enforcement Response (Enforcement and Compliance Action Elements):

The PRAMR includes categories for totals of both enforcement actions and civil penalty actions taken during the fiscal year. The EBL reviewed a representative sample of the 16 compliance action documents (Notice of Violation, and Warning Letters) that were issued during 07/08. The EBL also reviewed a representative sample of the 10 civil penalty actions issued by CAC during 07/08. CAC met DPR standards in the issuance of compliance and enforcement actions.

Effectiveness Evaluation Findings: The CAC enforcement response program element met DPR standards.

D) Non-Core and Desirable Activities:

Other “desirable” (“non-core”) program activities in 07/08 included holding 15 outreach sessions.

The EBL reviewed representative records from their non-core program areas (licensing, registration, etc.) and interviewed PUE managers and support staff who processed such records during 07/08. The EBL found CAC met DPR standards for these non-core areas of the PUE program.

Summary Statement:

During 07/08 CAC “licensed” staff spent approximately **8,258** hours in the PUE program, which is up from the previous 5-year average of 6,554 PUE program hours.

No deficiencies were identified in the CAC’s pesticide use enforcement program and the overall program is currently effective.